



The Rise of the Ottoman Turks and Its Historical Background

Author(s): William L. Langer and Robert P. Blake

Reviewed work(s):

Source: *The American Historical Review*, Vol. 37, No. 3 (Apr., 1932), pp. 468-505

Published by: [Oxford University Press](#) on behalf of the [American Historical Association](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1837961>

Accessed: 09/03/2013 23:45

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



Oxford University Press and American Historical Association are collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The American Historical Review*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

THE RISE OF THE OTTOMAN TURKS AND ITS HISTORICAL BACKGROUND¹

Who were the Ottoman Turks, and how is their phenomenal rise to power and empire to be explained? The question has baffled and mystified historians ever since the house of Osman came to play a prominent part in European history. It was in 1551 that Hieronymus Beck von Leopoldsdorf first brought to Vienna a chronicle written in the Turkish language. Forty years later Johannes Leunclavius (Loewenklaus) published his great collections of sources for Turkish history, which, as we now know, included in one form or another nearly everything in the way of Turkish chronicles that had any bearing on the early period of Ottoman history.² During the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries Turkish studies made rapid progress in Europe. Ignace Mouradja d'Ohsson's *Tableau Général de l'Empire Ottoman* (Paris, 1788-1824) is but the most striking evidence of the erudition and careful systematic work that was devoted to the subject.³

In 1827 there appeared at Budapest the first volume of Josef von Hammer's *Geschichte des Osmanischen Reiches*. The author stated in the preface that he had spent thirty years in preliminary studies and in the collection of materials. Of the fifty sources which he listed for his first volume only five had been previously used by European

¹ The authors are deeply indebted to Mr. William L. Wright, jr., and Mr. George C. Miles, both of Princeton University, for a critical reading of the manuscript and for a number of valuable suggestions.

² Johannes Leunclavius, *Annales Othmanidarum a Turcis sua Lingua scripti*, etc. (Frankfurt, 1588); German translation, with the addition of the Pandects (Frankfurt, 1590); and the *Historiae Musulmanae Turcorum de Monumentis ipsorum exscriptae*, etc. (Frankfurt, 1591).

³ The development of Turkish studies is well surveyed by Franz Babinger, *Die Türkischen Studien in Europa bis zum Auftreten Josef von Hammer-Purgstalls* (*Die Welt des Islam*, VII. [1919] 103-129), with additions and corrections by Carl Ausserer (*Der Islam*, XII. [1922] 226 ff.). The history of Turkish studies at Vienna is treated in the introduction of volume I. of the *Mitteilungen zur Osmanischen Geschichte* (Vienna, 1921). See also Franz Babinger, *Stambuler Buchwesen im 18. Jahrhundert* (Leipzig, 1919), and the introduction to his *Die Geschichtsschreiber der Osmanen und ihre Werke* (Leipzig, 1927); J. H. Kramers, *Over de Geschiedschrijving bij de Osmaansche Turken* (Leiden, 1922). The recent work of Turkish historians is well reviewed by Ettore Rossi, *Gli Studi di Storia Ottomana in Europa ed in Turchia nell'Ultimo Venticinquennio, 1900-1925* (*L'Oriente Moderno*, VI. [1926] 443-460).

historians. There is relatively little in the way of Turkish chronicles that Hammer did not know and make use of. He was the greatest authority of his time, perhaps of all time. His history and his special studies are still veritable mines of information. It is not to be wondered at that his successors were content to draw on him for facts and that little progress was made in the study of Turkish history for almost a hundred years after the appearance of his monumental work. Neither Zinkeisen, in his history of the Ottoman Empire in Europe, nor Nicholas Iorga, in his general history of the Ottoman Empire, nor Herbert Adams Gibbons, in his special study of the foundations of the Ottoman Empire, was able to make use of Turkish sources excepting as they had been translated into Western tongues. For the most part they were forced to rely upon the information contained in Hammer.⁴

Yet Hammer, for all the loving care with which he assembled manuscript material, did not approach Ottoman history in the spirit of modern critical scholarship. He was quite content to give a coherent narrative, based upon the chronicles, and frequently, when dealing with the obscure question of the rise of the dynasty, preferred the more elegant and finished works of later Turkish historians to the confused accounts of the early writers. Until the last decade even the most elementary work of comparing and collating, to say nothing of editing and publishing the basic chronicles, remained undone. Much of it still remains undone, though several German scholars have devoted themselves to the task and have done pioneer work in clearing away part of the débris. In 1922 Friedrich Giese examined a considerable number of anonymous *Tewārīh-i āl-i 'Oṣmān*, or early chronicles which, as he noticed, bore much similarity to each other and probably had a common origin.⁵

From these researches it appears that these chronicles, or their prototype, were written between 1490 and 1512, that is, in the reign of Bayezid II. Furthermore, they formed part of Leunclavius's collec-

⁴ J. W. Zinkeisen, *Geschichte des Osmanischen Reiches in Europa*, 7 vols. (Hamburg, 1840-1863). N. Iorga, *Geschichte des Osmanischen Reiches nach den Quellen dargestellt*, 5 vols. (Gotha, 1908-1913). H. A. Gibbons, *The Foundation of the Ottoman Empire* (Oxford, 1916).

⁵ F. Giese, *Die Altosmanischen Anonymen Chroniken*, Teil I., *Text und Variantenverzeichnis* (Breslau, 1922); Teil II., *Uebersetzung (Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes*, Leipzig, 1925, vol. XVII., no. 1). See also Giese, *Einleitung zu meiner Textausgabe der Altosmanischen Anonymen Chroniken (Mitteilungen zur Osmanischen Geschichte*, I. [1922] 49-75); L. Bonelli, *Di una Cronaca Turca del 1500 (Rendiconti della R. Accademia dei Lincei, Classe di Scienze Morale*, 1900, pp. 423 ff.).

tion, published toward the end of the sixteenth century. The original writer was evidently a mere compiler, who drew from the same source as two of the oldest identified Turkish historians, 'Aşikpaşazāde and Neşrî. Efforts have been made, especially by Paul Wittek, to determine the relationship between these earliest writers. Neşrî was used by Hammer in the version published by Leunclavius and known as the *Codex Hanivaldanus*. 'Aşikpaşazāde he was, to his great sorrow, unable to buy, though he made use of the beautiful manuscript acquired by Queen Christina of Sweden and now in the Vatican Library (*Codex Vaticanus*). Wittek was able to prove the close relationship of these two writers, and concluded that Neşrî, who wrote a world history of which only the sixth part, dealing with the Ottoman Turks, has come down to us, was a compiler who wrote not earlier than 1512. 'Aşikpaşazāde, who was born in 1400, but who wrote his history only in his ripe old age, about 1485, has evidently survived only in later versions, which contain continuations by other writers. Wittek believed that both the writer of the 'Aşikpaşazāde supplement and Neşrî drew on the original version of 'Aşikpaşazāde, who, in turn, relied upon a yet earlier chronicler, Jahşî Faķih, for his account of events prior to 1389 or 1403. No manuscript of Jahşî Faķih, whom 'Aşikpaşazāde himself mentions as his source, has yet been discovered. But in recent years a number of manuscripts in European libraries have been identified as copies of 'Aşikpaşazāde. Giese, who has published a critical edition of the text, lists twelve of them, and another has been found in Cairo. At least three of these newly identified manuscripts are better than the *Codex Vaticanus*, but they fail to settle the problems connected with this important source. The supplementary chapters vary considerably in the different versions. All we can be reasonably certain of is that 'Aşikpaşazāde himself ended his account with the year 1485 or 1486, and that the later chapters were probably written around the year 1510.⁶

⁶ Paul Wittek, Zum Quellenproblem der Aeltesten Osmanischen Chroniken (*Mitteilungen zur Osmanischen Geschichte*, I. [1922] 77-150), and the lengthy discussion of this article by J. H. Mordtmann (*Der Islam*, XIII. [1923] 152-169); further, Paul Wittek, Neues zu 'Aşikpaşazāde (*Mitteilungen zur Osmanischen Geschichte*, II. [1923-1925] 147-164); Franz Babinger, Chronologische Miszellen (*ibid.*, pp. 311-319); Hüseyin Nâmiķ, Jahşî Faķih (*ibid.*, pp. 319-321); F. Giese, Zum Literarischen Problem der Frühosmanischen Chroniken (*Orientalistische Literaturzeitung*, XXIX. [1926] 850-854), and Giese's introduction to his critical edition, *Die Altosmanische Chronik des 'Aşikpaşazāde* (Leipzig, 1929). The beginnings of Neşrî's chronicle were translated by Theodor Nöldeke and published in the *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft*, XIII. (1859) 176 ff.

The work of classifying the early chronicles has led to the careful scrutiny of many manuscripts in European and Turkish libraries, and to the discovery and identification of works hitherto unknown. In 1922 the eminent Turkish historian, Köprülüzâde Mehmed Fu'ad, pointed out the importance of Šükrüllâh, who in 1457 wrote a concise world history in Persian, and thus antedates all known Ottoman chroniclers. This important account has now been translated into German by Theodor Seif.⁷ Soon afterward Babinger discovered in the Bodleian Library a manuscript containing the chronicle of Uruj 'ibn 'Âdil, written in the time of Mehmed the Conqueror, and next to Šükrüllâh the oldest known Ottoman prose history. Several other manuscripts have, since then, been identified as copies of Uruj, and a critical edition of this work has been published.⁸

At about the same time J. H. Mordtmann identified a number of anonymous chronicles of the late fifteenth century as the work of Rûhî Edrenewî, while the Turkish historian Mükrimîn Khalîl made an even more important discovery of a chronicle dating from the time of Mehmed the Conqueror. Babinger has identified this as the work of Qaramânî Mehmed Paşa, grand wazir from 1478 to 1481. Parts of this chronicle have now been published in the *Historical Review* of the Ottoman Historical Institute (*Târiḫ-i Türk Enjümeni Mejmû'asî*, vol. XIV., 1924), but it has not yet been made available in any Western language.⁹

The investigations of these German scholars have demonstrated more clearly than ever before that we have no Turkish sources antedating the middle of the fifteenth century. The chronicles are, therefore, of doubtful value to the student of the origins of the empire. They unquestionably contain a certain amount of useful tradition, but

⁷ Köprülüzâde Mehmed Fu'ad, *Bemerkungen zur Religionsgeschichte Kleinasien* (*Mitteilungen zur Osmanischen Geschichte*, I. [1922] 203-222); Theodor Seif, *Der Abschnitt über die Osmanen in Šükrüllâh's Persischer Universalgeschichte* (*ibid.*, II. [1923-1925] 63-128).

⁸ Franz Babinger, *Die Frühosmanischen Jahrbücher des Urudsch* (Hannover, 1925); *Berichtigungen und Verbesserungen* (Hannover, 1926); and the review by G. Bergsträsser, in *Orientalistische Literaturzeitung*, XXIX. [1926] 433-438.

⁹ J. H. Mordtmann, Rûhî Edrenewî (*Mitteilungen zur Osmanischen Geschichte*, II. [1923-1925] 129-136); Franz Babinger, *Die Chronik des Qaramânî Mehmed Paşa* (*ibid.*, II. [1923-1926] 242-247). Babinger, in his *Die Geschichtsschreiber der Osmanen und ihre Werke* (Leipzig, 1927), catalogues the various historians in chronological order, states what is known of their lives, lists the known manuscripts of their works and the published editions, and gives references to discussions of their writings. This list, though necessarily provisional, is of immense value.

they must be used with the utmost caution. They are crude and naïve and generally confine themselves to a legendary account of the beginnings of the empire. A conventional genealogical table tracing the descent of Osman from Japhet and Noah relieves the writers of their embarrassment when they discuss the origins of the dynasty. They are, moreover, full of confusion and contradictions so serious that, as Babinger says, even the most unbridled imagination can not reconcile them. The truth is that, from the Turkish chronicles alone, no date in Ottoman history prior to 1421 can be fixed with any degree of certainty. No wonder that Hammer frequently relied upon the later historians and ignored the earlier sources.¹⁰

It might be thought that, failing Turkish sources, the Byzantine historians would be of service in clearing up the obscure story of early Ottoman history. Hammer, Iorga, and H. A. Gibbons all relied heavily upon them. Yet very little information is to be derived from the contemporary Greek writers. The Ottoman Turks were evidently too unimportant in the time of Osman to invite special attention, and the Byzantines were too much taken up with the spectacular dynastic struggles of the Paleologi to devote attention to events in Asia. Besides, the tendency toward classicism rampant among Byzantine historians after the twelfth century helped to veil the information about the irksome intruders behind a decorous rubric on the Persians, the Medes, etc. Consequently, only three contemporary Byzantine historians are worth mentioning at all. They are Nicephoras Gregoras, whose history covers the years 1204–1359; Pachymeres, dealing with the years 1261–1307; and John Cantacuzene, whose history treats the stormy period 1320–1356. Later historians, who, like Phrantzes and Chalcocandyles, are often quoted, wrote in the middle of the fifteenth century, that is, long after the events here under discussion. They are not without value, for, like the first Turkish chroniclers, they evidently drew upon earlier sources which are now lost. But, like the Turkish chroniclers, they can be accepted only with distinct reservations. Their story is much like that of their Turkish contemporaries, and anyone who has taken the trouble to read it will come away with the conviction that the critical historian can derive

¹⁰ The variations in the genealogical tables have been studied by P. Wittek, *Der Stammbaum der Osmanen* (*Der Islam*, XIV. [1925] 94–100); for further discussion, see Babinger, *Chronologische Miszellen* (*Mitteilungen zur Osmanischen Geschichte*, II. [1923–1926] 311–319), and the same author's *Byzantinisch-Osmanische Grenzstudien* (in *Festschrift für August Heisenberg*, *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, 27/28 [1929–1930] 411–415).

from them very little reliable data regarding the beginnings of the Ottoman Empire.¹¹

There remain the Arab writers, of whom three must be considered. First and foremost the great traveler, Ibn Baṭūṭāh, who traversed Asia Minor in the 1330's and visited Nicæa soon after its conquest by the Turks. His description of the country and of prevalent conditions is of great interest, but he says nothing whatever of the history of the Ottomans.¹² The second writer is Shihāb ad-Dīn al-'Umarī, the learned scribe of Damascus and Cairo, who in the 1340's, wrote a huge historical and geographical work covering most of the Mediterranean world. Al-'Umarī, too, gives a detailed account of conditions in Asia Minor, but is silent in regard to the beginnings of the Ottoman state.¹³

Neither of these two writers, so far as we can see, was made use of by Iorga, though H. A. Gibbons drew heavily upon them for his account of Asia Minor at the beginning of the fourteenth century. Since his time, notice has been drawn to an interesting passage in the famous World History of Ibn Khaldūn. It deals directly with the origins of the Ottoman power, and, since it was written prior to 1402, is the oldest known account. Unfortunately it is very brief and adds little to our knowledge. Attention was first called to it by the late Clément Huart, the eminent French scholar, who published a translation of it. Some years later it was noted by Richard Hartmann, who published a summary, evidently without knowing of Huart's translation.¹⁴

¹¹ R. Guiland, *Essai sur Nicéphore Gregoras* (Paris, 1926); J. Draeseke, Zu Johannes Kantakuzenos (*Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, IX. [1900] 72-84); William Miller, The Historians Doukas and Phrantzes (*Journal of Hellenic Studies*, XLVI. [1926] 63-71); and the same author's The Last Athenian Historian, Laonikos Chakondyles (*ibid.*, XLII. [1922] 36-49). The traditional story of Turkish origins, as found in Turkish and Byzantine sources, has been republished by two competent scholars: J. Draeseke, Der Uebergang der Osmanen nach Europa im XIV. Jahrhundert (*Neue Jahrbücher für das Klassische Altertum*, XXXI. [1913] 476-504), and F. von Kraelitz, Das Osmanische Herrscherhaus und die Gründung des Osmanischen Reiches (*Oesterreichische Monatschrift für den Orient*, XL. [1914] 38-40).

¹² C. Deffrémery and B. R. Sanguinetti, *Voyages d'Ibn Batoutah* (Paris, 1877), II. 317 ff.

¹³ French translation by M. Quatremère, Notice de l'Ouvrage qui a pour Titre Mesalek Alabsar fi Memalek Alamsar (*Notices et Extraits des Manuscrits*, XIII. [1838] 151-384). There is now a critical edition of the part of Al-'Umarī's work dealing with Asia Minor, by Franz Taeschner, *Al-'Umarī's Bericht über Anatolien in seinen Werken Masālik al-absār fi Mamālik al-amṣār* (Leipzig, 1929).

¹⁴ Clément Huart, in his review of Gibbons's book (*Journal Asiatique*, ser. 2, IX. [1917] 345-350); the translation in Huart, Les Origines de l'Empire Ottoman (*Journal*

In the absence of literary records, the historian is frequently able to derive valuable information from the study of coins or monuments. Here again the prospect for Turkish studies is disheartening. Osman coined no money, but very interesting coins, struck in the first year of the reign of Orkhan, have recently been published by a Turkish scholar.¹⁵ As for inscriptions, the earliest yet discovered is on the castle at Brusa, and dates from the reign of Orkhan, probably from the year 1337 or 1338. There is another dating from the reign of Murad I. (c. 1378) on the Yeshil Jami at Ismid, but the splendid long inscription in Turkish at Kutahia, dating from the year 1411, belongs to the last Kermian ruler, and not to the Ottomans. Such buildings as were erected by the early sultans at Nicæa and were still standing in our day were mostly destroyed by the retreating Greek armies in 1921–1922, so that there is little chance for valuable results from archæological investigation.¹⁶

It is obvious that, for lack of the source material usually at the disposal of the historian, the whole question of the origins of the Ottoman Empire can not be approached directly. The problem must be attacked from the rear, so to speak. We must find out not only who the Turks were, but also what was the background of their rise to power. Recent historians have recognized the necessity for this procedure. Iorga, for example, devotes one hundred and fifty pages of his five volume work to a discussion of the Seljuq Turks, whereas Hammer disposed of this matter in forty pages, though his history took ten volumes to reach the time of the treaty of Küchük Kainarji. H. A. Gibbons, in his *Foundation of the Ottoman Empire*, made an even more valiant effort to throw light upon the conditions in Asia Minor. Relying on Ibn Baṭṭūṭāh and Al-ʿUmarī, he studied the disruption of the Seljuq state, while from the Byzantine historians he drew the material for his account of the weakness of the Greek Empire. His stress upon the utter impotence of the Byzantine state and his emphasis upon the essentially European character of early

des Savants, n. s., XV. [Apr., 1917] 157–166); see also Richard Hartmann, Das “älteste” uns Erhaltene “Osmanische Geschichte Enthaltende Werk” (*Mitteilungen zur Osmanischen Geschichte*, II. [1923–1926] 306–308).

¹⁵ ʿAlī, ʿOṭhmanlī İmperatorluğunun ilk Sikkesi ve ilk Aqchesi (*Tārīkh-i ʿOṣmānī Enjümeni Mejmū-ʿası*, VIII. [1917] 48).

¹⁶ Franz Taeschner, Anatolische Forschungen (*Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft*, LXXXII. [1928] 83–118); Franz Taeschner and Paul Wittek. Die Vezirfamilie der Gandarlyzāde und ihre Denkmäler (*Der Islam*, XVIII. [1929] 60–115).

Ottoman expansion is without question the most important contribution made by his monograph. Yet neither Iorga nor Gibbons had much to go by on the Oriental side; for the early history of the Turks the books of writers like Vambéry and Cahun, excellent perhaps in their day, but now superseded; on the history of the Seljuqs not a single scholarly monograph. The fact is that the history of the Seljuq sultanate of Rum has not been adequately treated even in our own day, at least not in any Western language. Most of the Seljuq sources that have been published by Houtsma, Melioranski, and others, deal with the earlier period of Seljuq domination, and refer primarily to the eastern parts of the Seljuq empire. Turkish historians have, of recent years, published a certain amount of inscriptional material from former Seljuq centers in Anatolia, and have written some good monographic studies on the history of the succession states of the sultanate of Rum. But the history of that sultanate, say from 1100 to 1300, still requires systematic treatment.¹⁷ Of geographical or descriptive material there is nothing on the Turkish side. During the sixteenth century the Turks translated some of the Arab writers, but it was only at the very end of the sixteenth and the beginning of the seventeenth century that serious works like those of Meḥmed al-ʿĀsiq and Hājji Khalifa made their appearance.¹⁸ As for the Arab geographers, Ibn Baṭūṭāh and Al-ʿUmarī, valuable as their observations are, they do not strike at fundamentals. Their descriptions of the Ottoman territories are brief and anecdotal. Ibn Baṭūṭāh was more interested in the hot baths and sanatorium built by Sultan Orkhan at Brusa than in the problems which concern us. Al-ʿUmarī was himself never on the ground, and relied upon what he could learn from other travelers whom he met at Cairo.

¹⁷ M. T. Houtsma, *Recueil de Textes relatifs à l'Histoire des Seldjoucides* (Leiden, 1886–1902); some portions of the Saljuq-namé have been translated and paraphrased by P. Melioranski, *Sel'dzukname, kak Istočnik dlya Istorii Vizantii v XII i XIII Vekakh* (*Vizantiiskii Vremennik*, I. [1894] 613 ff.). The best account, though not definitive, is to be found in the first volume of Köprülü-zāde Meḥmed Fū'ād's *History of the Turks* (*Türkiyâ Tâ'rikk-i*, Constantinople, 1923). The article on the Seljuqs, by H. M. J. Loewe, in the *Cambridge Medieval History* (vol. IV., ch. X. [B]) is hardly more than the usual catalogue of battles, rulers, and dynasties. In English, the best treatment is still that of E. G. Browne, *A Literary History of Persia* (London, 1906), II. 165 ff., 297 ff., but see also M. T. Houtsma, *Some Remarks on the History of the Saljuks* (*Acta Orientalia*, III. 136 ff.). Most of the monographic studies in Turkish are listed by Babinger in the introduction of his *Die Geschichtsschreiber der Osmanen und ihre Werke*.

¹⁸ Franz Taeschner, *Die Geographische Literatur der Osmanen* (*Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft*, LXXVII. [1923] 31–80).

In order to understand the rise of the Ottoman Turks one must have clearly in mind various factors inherent in the geography and history of Asia Minor, as well as certain fundamental developments in the conditions of Anatolia in the period just preceding the appearance of Ertoghrlu, Osman, and their followers. The Anatolian plateau forms a geologic unit. It is a relatively barren plain with a salt sink in the center, and is surrounded on all sides by rather lofty mountain ranges. Its surface is so diversified that it is hard to maintain communication between the different parts. The salt sink in the center, to the west of the Halys River, impedes direct longitudinal traffic; the wooded areas on the coast have little in common and no connection with the barren plains of the uplands; and the deep river valleys are effectually sundered from each other by the mountains. While the mountain ranges do not cut up the terrain to the same extent as in the Balkans, the general relief is distinctly broken. These individual and sharply marked geographical units form the districts and cantons which play a large part in the life of Asia Minor. They are the warp and woof of which the changing web of Anatolian history has been woven. If they play but little part in the written records, the reason is that the Byzantine sources contain little information about the provinces of the empire, while the Armenian historians were for the most part locally minded.

At any rate, the canton was a characteristic phenomenon of the Anatolian plateau. The unending list of principalities ruled by the Hittite monarchs, by Mithridates Eupator, Tigranes, and other potentates, must have been of this type.¹⁹ They were organized on a clan basis and even when small and weak were remarkably tenacious of life. Especially in eastern Anatolia they continually emerged unscathed from the wreck of larger kingdoms. Thus geography made for disruption, and explains the strong tendency in Anatolian history toward the formation of small social and political entities.²⁰

The counterpart of the cantonal structure was the confused

¹⁹ See the *Cambridge Ancient History*, vol. II., chs. I. and V.; L. A. Meyer and J. Garstang, *Index of Hittite Names, Geographical with Notes* (British School of Archaeology, *Supplemental Papers*, 1923) and the same authors' essay, Kizzuwadna and Other Hittite States (*Journal of Egyptian Archaeology*, II. [1925] 23-35).

²⁰ Cantonal structure in Armenia and Georgia is well discussed by I. Džavakhov, *Gosudarstvennyi Stroï drevnei Gruzii i drevnei Armenii* (St. Petersburg, 1905); and N. G. Adonts, *Armeniya v Epokhu Iustiniana* (St. Petersburg, 1909). J. Laurens, *L'Arménie entre Byzance et l'Islam depuis la Conquête Arabe jusqu'en 886* (Paris, 1919), is wholly useless excepting as a collection of material.

linguistic map of the region. The diversity of tongues spoken in Asia Minor was very great and went back to the dawn of recorded history. The Hittite kings used prayers in seven distinct tongues in the state liturgies.²¹ Speaking of the Caucasus region Strabo says: "At any rate seventy tribes come together in it (Dioscurias), though others, who care nothing for the facts, actually say three hundred. All speak different languages because of the fact that, by reason of their obstinacy and ferocity, they live in scattered groups and without intercourse with one another."²² Neither the Hellenization attempted by the Seleucids and the Pergamene kings, nor the partial Latin or Greek urbanization which took place under the Roman Empire effectually extirpated the native dialects and patois. Isaurian and kindred Asianic dialects remained in current use at least until the seventh century. Knowledge of Greek was apparently rather superficial and probably sporadic in the villages, a thin gloss over the underlying barbarism of customs and speech.²³

The confused racial and linguistic conditions in Anatolia were accentuated by religious factors. With the appearance of Christianity and the adoption of the Zoroastrian cult by the Sasanid rulers of Persia (226 A.D.), missionary activity and persecution began to take place.²⁴ Then came the first Islamic deluge, in the seventh century. This, to be sure, left but few traces in western and central Asia Minor, and even in the East, where the new frontier of the Byzantine and Arab empires ran through Armenia, there was little contact between the Moslem towns and the Christian countryside. A good many Armenian and Georgian families emigrated southward and westward, but those that remained under Moslem rule appear to have gotten along very well with the conquerors. In the tenth century we actually find members of the Armenian and Georgian nobility, who were Christians, adopting Moslem names.²⁵

²¹ See E. Forrer, *Die Inschriften und Sprachen des Hatti-Reiches (Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft, LXXVI. [1922] 174-269).*

²² Strabo II, 2. 16 (translation by H. L. Jones, Loeb Library edition, V. 208 ff.).

²³ See K. Holl, *Das Fortleben der Volkssprachen in Kleinasien in Nachchristlicher Zeit (Hermes, XLIII. [1908] 240-254)*; W. M. Ramsay, *The Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia* (Oxford, 1895-1897), I. 9 ff.; Richard Leonhard, *Paphlagonia* (Berlin, 1915), chs. VII., IX., X. The interesting and instructive linguistic evolution of a Caucasian district is given by N. Marr, *Georgii Merčul, Žitie sv. Grigoriya Khandzt'iiskago* (St. Petersburg, 1911).

²⁴ J. Labourt, *Le Christianisme dans l'Empire Perse sous la Dynastie Sassanide* (second ed., Paris, 1904).

²⁵ M. Ghazarian, *Armenien unter der Arabischen Herrschaft bis zur Entstehung des*

Of much greater importance was the appearance of the Turks. First into Persia and Mesopotamia, then into Armenia and Anatolia proper, came successive infiltrations, impelled by the same pressure from the rear that their kindred and congeners, the Pečenegs and Kumans, were sensing in the northern steppes. Great advances have been made in recent years in the study of the racial affinities, the ethnological position and the religious status of these Turks. For the purposes of this paper it is unnecessary to discuss the interesting researches of Thomsen, Marquart, Pelliot, Barthold, and others who, by the use of Chinese sources and the discovery of early Turkish inscriptions, have succeeded in tracing back the existence of Turkish tribes to the beginning of the Christian Era, or even further.²⁶

When the first waves of Arab invasion reached the banks of the Oxus, Turkestan was in the hands of Turkish tribes. For the space of a generation, in fact from 560 to 585, a mighty Turkish khanate existed whose confines stretched from the Sea of Azov to the Altaï, and relations with it formed the central point of the diplomatic endeavors of both the Roman emperors and the Sasanid Shahan-shahs. This overweighty structure collapsed almost as soon as it was erected, and the congeries of tribes, Turkish and others, resolved itself into an eastern and a western branch. These groups have left traces behind them in the monuments, carved and written. To them are attributable the Orkhon inscriptions belonging to the eastern kingdom, the fragments of literature in the Uighur dialect, written in a script derived from the Syriac, as well as documents written not only in Uighur characters, but also in Nestorian Syriac, Manichæan, Brahmi, and other alphabets, and other monuments which have been found in the sands and caves of Turkestan. The culture of the Turkish races was largely external, and was based upon the syncretistic civilization, partly Christian, partly Manichæan, partly Buddhist, which we find in the forgotten states of Chinese Turkestan. Chinese influences were also opera-

Bagratidenreiches (Marburg, 1903); J. Laurents, *op. cit.*; K. Kostaneanc, *Vimikan Taregir* (*Bibliotheca Armeno-Georgica*, 1913, vol. II.); H. Hübschmann, *Grammatik der Armenischen Sprache* (Leipzig, 1897), vol. II. pt. 2, pp. 285 ff., 320-321.

²⁶ See especially the late W. W. Barthold's address to the First Turcological Congress at Baku in 1926, now published in German translation by Paul Wittek, under the title, *Der Heutige Stand und die Nächsten Aufgaben der Geschichtlichen Erforschung der Türkvolker* (*Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft*, LXXXIII. [1929] 121-142); the bibliography in Marie A. Czaplicka, *Turks of Central Asia in History and at the Present Day* (Oxford, 1918); and the most recent study of the history of the Turks by W. W. Barthold, article, *Turks, History*, in *Encyclopaedia of Islam* (1931).

tive. After long struggles the Turkestan area was subdued by the Arabs in 758-759, and the Turkish tribes of the region, who belonged to the family of the Ghuzz (Oguz) gradually adopted Islam during the ninth and tenth centuries. The eastern branch maintained itself with ups and downs only until 745, when it was overthrown by the Uighurs.²⁷

In the tenth century the conquests of the Chitai, a Mongolian race, seem to have started the Turks moving westward into Islamic regions. But long before this, at least as early as the middle of the eighth century, Turkish slaves were kept at Baghdad and had become the most influential element in the armies of the caliph. There must have been thousands of them in Mesopotamia and eastern Asia Minor before the Ghuzz tribes arrived in the tenth and eleventh centuries. But it was the newcomers who set up the Seljuq dynasty and in a short time reunited the scattered states of Islam, thus consolidating the Mohammedan power just in time to meet the onslaughts of the Crusaders. From the start the Seljuqs proved themselves valiant champions of religion. It is hardly too much to say that they saved Islam and laid the basis for the Turkification of Asia Minor.²⁸

The history of the Seljuqs yet remains to be written, but certain outstanding factors in the Turk invasion are fairly clear. The Seljuqs, like most of the Turk tribes of Central Asia, were nomadic in their habits and forms of organization. But the social structure of the newcomers was in no sense a hindrance to their settlement in large numbers in Asia Minor. From time immemorial the agricultural, village-dwelling populations of the Anatolian plateau had been the neighbors of nomadic stocks. The villages, for the most part, were located along the slopes of the foothills or in the more fertile and well watered river valleys. They did not extend to the upland pastures which are thickly blanketed with snow during the winter, nor out into the barren, grass covered, and fairly arid steppe beyond the foothill belt.

²⁷ W. Radloff, *Die Altürkischen Inschriften der Mongolei* (St. Petersburg, 1895; N. F., 1897); Barthold, *loc. cit.* There are now German and English translations of the Orkhon inscriptions, based upon the Danish translations of Wilhelm Thomsen, by H. H. Schaeder (*Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft*, LXXVIII. [1924] 121-175, and E. D. Ross (*Bulletin of the School of Oriental Studies*, vol. V., pt. 4 [1930], pp. 861-876).

²⁸ Barthold, *loc. cit.*; Wittek, *loc. cit.* By far the best studies of this period are Köprülüâzâde Mehmed Fu'ad's *Türkîyâ Tâ'rikh-i*, vol. I. (Constantinople, 1923), and W. W. Barthold's *Turkestan down to the Mongol Invasion* (Gibb Memorial Series, n. s., vol. V., London, 1928). A good brief introduction is Eugen Oberhummer's *Die Türken und das Osmanische Reich* (Berlin, 1917).

These areas had long been the habitat of what we might term the synoikistic nomad, a social phenomenon much more familiar to us from the history of Iran than from the history of Asia Minor.²⁹ On the Iranian plateau the symbiosis of nomad and cultivator has continued unbroken to the present day. The adjustment between the two elements is easily made and a *modus vivendi* is not hard to establish. It is less commonly known that the very same phenomenon is characteristic of Asia Minor at the present day, and the same is true, though to a lesser extent, of the Balkans.³⁰ The last, westernmost representatives of this movement are probably the gypsies. So far as Asia Minor is concerned these peoples evidently go back to very remote times. It appears from the Hittite tablets that in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries B.C. a tribe of nomads who lived in the center of Asia Minor and were primarily engaged in horse breeding spoke a language closely akin to pure Sanskrit, and differing decidedly from the *Ursprache* of the dominant folk, Indo-Europeans though they were.³¹ Our material does not suffice to show whether during the Byzantine period these nomad elements were racially of a different stock than the populations around them, nor can we show this for Armenia, excepting perhaps in the case of the Kurds. There seems to have been some diversity of race between the various unsettled or nomadic elements.

At any rate, the peculiar populational conditions in Asia Minor made it possible for large numbers of Turks, arriving over a period of many decades, to slip through the normal channels of life without causing much disturbance. They brought with them the nomad's ferocity and energy, but also the nomad's willingness to submit to discipline. Gradually they settled down to an agricultural life, living in villages side by side with the original non-Turkish settlements. The local population, accustomed to living with an intrusive nomad element, cared but little to what stock the intruders belonged. To be sure, some individuals and even families moved out, especially those belonging to the upper classes. For the most part they moved into Byzantine territory, migrating southward along the Taurus.³² But

²⁹ The Bakhtiyars are a good modern example, but the Parthians retained certain nomadic characteristics down to the fall of their state.

³⁰ F. W. Hasluck, *Christianity and Islam under the Sultans* (Oxford, 1929), I. 5 ff. See an interesting passage in the life of St. George the Athonite in P. Peeters, *Histoires Monastiques Géorgiennes* (Brussels, 1923), pp. 102 ff.

³¹ P. Giles, in *Cambridge Ancient History*, II. 13.

³² The importance of this movement is emphasized in the otherwise useless book of the late F. W. Bussell, *The Roman Empire: Essays on the Constitutional History*

the large mass of the population, not only in the country, but also in the towns, gradually became submerged by Islam or apostasized.³³ The result was the striking disappearance of the Greek language and culture from the interior of Asia Minor, an important development which deserves far more study than it has received.

This process can be understood only if one remembers that the Greek population in many parts of Asia Minor could never have been very dense, and that Greek culture was hardly more than a veneer so far as the mass of the people was concerned. Along the frontiers the population tended to be heretical in a large measure—Armenians, Paulicians, Mardaïtes, Nestorians, who were not Greek by origin and were distinctly unsympathetic to the Greeks in a religious way.³⁴ In a number of instances we find serious disturbances arising because of the persecution of these heretics by the orthodox authorities. After the Seljuq conquest a distinctly nationalistic and chauvinistic trend made its appearance in the Orthodox Church itself, so that there was less chance than ever for the Greeks to carry on successful propaganda outside Byzantine territory.³⁵

The accuracy of this view may be established by a study of the areas of Asia Minor where the Greek language survived up to modern times.³⁶ We must exclude later colonies of islanders who established themselves upon the seacoast, and we must except also the trading elements present in every Turkish town. This having been done we find that Greek is (or was) spoken in the interior of Asia Minor in but two areas: Pontus, in the valleys leading back from the seacoast from Rizé to Kerasund, some inland colonies between Pontus and Cappadocia near Shabin-Kara-Hissar, and some twenty-six villages in Cappadocia in the neighborhood of Tyana and Nazianos. To these

from the Accession of Domitian, 81 A.D., to the Retirement of Nicephorus III., 1081 A.D. (London, New York, 1910). The effects of the nomad infiltrations are well discussed by Ramsay, in *The Cities and Bishopricks of Phrygia*, II. 302.

³³ H. Gelzer, *Abriss der Kaisergeschichte* (in Karl Krumbacher, *Geschichte der Byzantinischen Litteratur*, second ed., Munich, 1896), p. 1012, is almost certainly wrong in assuming that there was a sudden and wholesale apostasy. See R. Oberhummer and H. Zimmerer, *Durch Syrien und Kleinasien* (Berlin, 1899), ch. XVI.

³⁴ See A. Vogt, *Basile Ier* (Paris, 1908), pp. 295 ff., and A. A. Vasiliev, *Vizantiya i Araby za Vremya Makedonskoi Dinastii* (St. Petersburg, 1905), *passim*.

³⁵ This is exemplified in the affair of Johannes Italos (1085). See F. Chalandon, *Essai sur le Règne d'Alexis I. Comnène* (Paris, 1900), pp. 310 ff., and especially N. Marr, Ioann Petritsi, Gruzinskii Neoplatonik XII-go Veka (*Zapiski Vostochnago Otdeleniya Imp. Rossiiskago Arkheologičeskago Obščestva*, XIX. [1909] 53-114).

³⁶ See the excellent study of R. M. Dawkins, *Modern Greek in Asia Minor* (Cambridge, 1916).

we can add Silli near Konia, Livisi in Lycia, and Gylolde in Lydia. The dialects spoken in these places show that the Greek population goes back to Byzantine times and further. All other colonies date definitely from the Turkish period.

One or two interesting deductions can be made from this distribution. First, the Greek character of the Pontic area was obviously due to the continued existence of the empire of Trebizond. Second, Greek disappeared wholly from western Asia Minor. Third, the Cappadocian centers were probably stimulated by the presence of the Pontic ones. Clearly, the hold which Hellenism had on the Anatolian plateau was relatively slight.

Even if it is true, and there is evidence to substantiate the view, that the Turks, whether Seljuq or Ottoman, pursued destructive tactics in making their conquests, it seems to be equally true that, once an area was subjugated, conditions rapidly became settled. Sir William M. Ramsay, most eminent of modern students of Anatolian history, has drawn a vivid picture of the course of events in the Byzantine-Seljuq frontier area in Phrygia during the period from the end of the eleventh to the end of the twelfth century. The evidence indicates, he says, that much of the territory was voluntarily abandoned to the Turks by the warring claimants to the Byzantine throne, who were not scrupulous in choosing their friends. The Seljuq conquest was at first merely nominal, and involved little more than the payment of tribute. To be sure, there was more or less campaigning in this area throughout the whole period, and the warfare was ferocious and destructive. But it was spasmodic and inconclusive. Apart from the raids and the campaigns the country was quiet and the rule of the Turks lenient and tolerant. "Even the prejudiced Byzantine historians", says Sir William, "let drop a few hints that the Christians in many cases preferred the rule of the sultans to that of the emperors." So far as one can detect the inhabitants submitted without offering resistance. There is no mention of defense. "Each city stood until the Turks gathered power to overthrow it." Furthermore, there is no trace of religious persecution by the Seljuqs. Most of the Christians evidently became Mohammedan, and Ramsay thinks that the Oriental substratum in the population asserted itself and took naturally to an Oriental religion. However that may be, a study that has been made of the evolution of the Christian archdioceses in Asia Minor after the beginning of the Seljuq conquest indicates that there was a very rapid

decrease in the number of Christians and a very rapid impoverishment of the congregations. Since it is fairly clear that the conquerors spared the inhabitants and granted them religious freedom, it must be assumed that the population went over voluntarily to the new faith, either in order to retain its property or else to avoid being at a disadvantage in other ways. Apostasy was evidently a practical measure for many people, and one which did not occasion much searching of hearts.³⁷

It seems to us that the important process of Islamization in Asia Minor can be made yet more easily understandable if the peculiar color of Turkish Islam is borne in mind. It will be remembered that, almost from the beginning, there was a pronounced mystical trend in the teaching of Islam. The literature on the subject is immense, yet the problem still presents innumerable difficulties and still leads to sharp differences of opinion among competent authorities. Here it need only be said that in Islam, where there was no organized church government or single authority, there was more room for variant interpretations and divergent viewpoints. The ascetic, mystical strain in Islam was traced back by the mystics themselves to the earlier part of the Prophet's own career, as set forth in the Koran. Some scholars have tried to connect this attitude with the strong movement of opposition which developed against the Omayyads and eventually led to the establishment of the 'Abbāsid caliphate. But the forces which finally overthrew the Omayyads came from the confines of the empire, from Khurāsān, a region which was one of the strongholds of Messianism. This Messianic movement, while it was, in a sense, mystical, appears to have been quite distinct from Islamic mysticism (Ṣūfiism) properly speaking, as it developed in the time of the 'Abbāsids. In any event, the theory and practice of mysticism was worked out more especially in Iraq, Syria, and Egypt. How much of Christian influence, of Neo-Platonism, of Manichæanism, of Buddhism, and of other Persian and Indian elements went into its make-up we need not stop to inquire. The subject is one on which even the most distinguished authorities seem unable to agree. In fact it is almost impossible to determine even the relation of this movement to unorthodox Islam (Shī'ah), if, indeed, there was a connection. All we can say is that both involved a belief in an esoteric doctrine which had

³⁷ Ramsay, I. 15 ff., 26 ff., 300-301, II. 695 ff.; A. H. Wächter, *Der Verfall des Griechentums in Kleinasien im XIV. Jahrhundert* (Leipzig, 1903).

supposedly come down from the Prophet through his son-in-law, the fourth caliph, 'Alī.³⁸

Central Asia, that great trade emporium of the early Middle Ages, lay at the junction of many Eastern religious currents. Köprülüzâde Mehmed Fu'ad, the eminent Turkish historian, has made a detailed study of the religious evolution of the Turks while they were still in that region, and has, with the aid of many unpublished documents, done more than anyone to throw light on the utterly obscure religious history of Asia Minor in the times of the Seljuq and early Ottoman rulers.³⁹ He stresses the fact that the Turks, even after their conversion to Islam, retained many elements of their earlier pagan religion. They disliked the rigorous tenets of orthodox Islam, because these tenets conflicted with their own traditions. For that reason they, like most nomad peoples, leaned strongly in the direction of mysticism, and favored the holy men, monks, and dervishes. The Central Asian cloisters and orders became more and more powerful, and had a larger popular following, at times, than the rulers themselves.⁴⁰

The greatest figure in the history of Turkish mysticism was Ahmed Yasâwi, who lived in Central Asia in the eleventh century and founded the first dervish order using the Turkish language. It was he who translated the ideas of Şūfiism into Turkish. His following was immense and his influence on the later development of other

³⁸ Of recent discussions we mention, as among the best, the various works of R. A. Nicholson; D. B. Macdonald, *The Religious Attitude and Life in Islam* (Chicago, 1909); Ignaz Goldziher, *Vorlesungen über den Islam* (second ed., Heidelberg, 1925; French translation: *Le Dogme et la Loi de l'Islam*, Paris, 1920); H. Lammens, *L'Islam: Croyances et Institutions* (Beirut, 1926); Louis Massignon, *La Passion d'Al-Hallâj* (Paris, 1914-1921), with exhaustive bibliography; Theodor Nöldeke, *Zur Ausbreitung des Schiitismus (Der Islam, XIII. [1923] 70-81)*; Richard Hartmann, *Zur Frage nach der Herkunft und den Anfängen des Sufitums (ibid., VI. [1916] 31-70)*; H. H. Schaefer, *Manichäer und Muslime (Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft, LXXXII. [1928] lxxvi-lxxx)*.

³⁹ Köprülüzâde Mehmed Fu'ad, *Türk Edebiyatında ilk Mütessavvıflar* (Constantinople, 1919); *Les Origines du Bektachisme (Actes du Congrès International d'Histoire des Religions, Paris, 1925, II. 391-411)*. There is an excellent analysis of the former work by Theodor Menzel, entitled Köprülüzâde Mehmed Fu'ad's Werk über die ersten Mystiker in der Türkischen Literatur (*Körösi Czoma-Archiv [Zeitschrift für Türkische Philologie und Verwandte Gebiete]*, II. [1927] 281-310). Menzel's article, *Die Aeltesten Türkischen Mystiker (Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft, LXXIX. [1925] 269-289)* is hardly more than a summary of the same work. See also the stimulating review of Köprülüzâde by Clément Huart, in the *Journal des Savants* (n. s., XX. [1922] 5-18), and the article, *Turks, Literature*, by Köprülüzâde, *Encyclopaedia of Islam* (1931).

⁴⁰ Barthold, *Turkestan down to the Mongol Invasion*, pp. 310 ff.

orders was of prime importance. With their conquest of Asia Minor the Seljuqs transplanted all these orders into their new possessions. The princes themselves were strictly orthodox (Sunnite) and Islamic mysticism, which reached its highest development in the time of the Seljuqs in the persons of Ibnu'l-'Arabi and Jalāl ed-Dīn i-Rumī, was officially in complete consonance with the demands of strict observance. The great Mevlevi order, founded by Jalāl ed-Dīn, was always orthodox. But among the common people all sorts of heterodoxy flourished, mixed with primitive religious practices. The popular dervishes propounded theories which, as Köprülüẓade says, were a conglomerate of esoteric Moslem elements, indigenous beliefs of Asia Minor and Iran, and an admixture of various schismatic forms of Christianity, together with philosophic Şūfic ideas. Evidently it was not far from these primitive religious tenets to the popular religion prevalent in Asia Minor in the form of heterodox Christianity. At the present day Asia Minor is still full of seminomadic tribes whose religion is a mixture of Shī'ah Mohammedanism and Christianity, with a strong substratum of pagan animistic elements.⁴¹

Now it is a general phenomenon throughout the Near East that, inasmuch as religious faith was closely connected with linguistic and cultural influences, a change of religion tended to bring about a change of culture as well. A striking instance of this is perhaps the fate of the Chalcedonite Armenians, who were ultimately absorbed by the Georgians. The apostates tended naturally to lose their national peculiarities and ultimately also their native language.⁴² The upshot of the Seljuq invasion and conquest of Asia Minor was, then, the disappearance of Christianity and Greek influence in the larger part of Asia Minor, and the effective Turkification and Islamization of this region. Idrīsī, describing the country in 1117, still used the old names, while Ibn Baṭūṭāh, traversing the region in the 1330's, used purely Turkish names. This is a striking illustration of the transformation

⁴¹ Köprülüẓade, *loc. cit.*; Franz Babinger, *Der Islam in Kleinasien (Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft, LXXVI. [1922] 126-152)*, and the vigorous reply by Theodor Nöldeke, *Zur Ausbreitung des Schiitismus (Der Islam, XIII. [1923] 70-81)*. See furthermore, the illuminating discussion in Hasluck, I. 128, 139 ff., and ch. XIII., and the article, Shī'ah, by R. Strothmann, in *Encyclopaedia of Islam* (1931).

⁴² N. Marr, *Kreščenie Armyan, Gruzin, Abkhazov, Alanov sv. Grigoriem: Arabskaya Versiya (Zapiski Vostochnago Otdeleniya Imp. Rossiiskago Arkheologicheskago Obščestva, XV. [1904-1905] 63 ff.)*; also his *Arkaun, Mongol'skoe Nazvanie Khristian v svyazi s Voprosom ob Armyanakh Khalkedonitakh (Vizantiiskii Vremennik, XII. [1906] 1-68)*.

that had taken place. It will readily be seen how important a preparation this was for the later establishment of Ottoman rule.⁴³

The thirteenth century was a memorable period in the history of the Near East, and especially of Asia Minor. It witnessed the establishment and disappearance of the ephemeral Latin Empire and the temporary transfer of the Greek Empire to Nicæa, as well as the decline and disintegration of the Seljuq sultanate of Rum (Konia) and the first great Mongol conquest. For the moment we must confine our attention to these latter developments.

The Mongols, having conquered Armenia, defeated the sultan of Rum in 1243 and temporarily occupied the capital of the Seljuq state. From that time on the Seljuq ruler was a tributary of the Mongol Great Khan or his lieutenants. Just what did this mean? We do not know exactly, for we lack information as to how the Mongols governed territories of this type. Suffice it to say, however, that the Mongols never really occupied Asia Minor. Their headquarters were in Armenia. Military authorities were established at Konia and other key places, and they certainly interfered in the domestic affairs of the vassal states. Occasionally the vassal rulers were obliged to furnish contingents for new Mongol expeditions. In fact, it is said that the sultan of Rum was defeated largely by Armenian and Georgian contingents fighting in an army only the nucleus of which was Mongol. The Mongols appear never to have been very numerous.⁴⁴ But the chief duty of the Mongol agents was to see to the collection and payment of the tribute in the territories not actually occupied by their armies. Thus we are told that the sultan of Rum had to deliver annually 1,200,000 hyperpers, 500 pieces of silk, 500 camels, etc., and that he had to supply the Mongols, whenever they were in his territory, with horses, provisions, and other necessities.⁴⁵

We do not believe, therefore, that the Mongol conquest made any very profound changes in Anatolia. It served to drive many more Turks from Central Asia into the peninsula, but it caused little permanent social or cultural change, despite the ravages and devastations of the armies. Once a country was conquered, a lenient régime was instituted and the greatest toleration shown the Christians. Thus the most magnificent Armenian manuscript now extant was written at

⁴³ Leonhard, ch. X. This important transformation is well discussed by T. Kowalski, article, Turkish Dialects, in *Encyclopaedia of Islam* (1931).

⁴⁴ Georg Altunian, *Die Mongolen und ihre Eroberungen in Kaukasischen und Kleinasiatischen Ländern im XIII. Jahrhundert* (Berlin, 1911), p. 80.

⁴⁵ C. d'Ohsson, *Histoire des Mongols* (Paris, 1834), III. 83.

Erznga (Erzinjan) between the years 1269 and 1271, that is, during the Mongol rule. It is a complete manuscript of the Old and New Testaments, with what is unquestionably the finest series of Biblical illuminations now in existence, extraordinary in technique and flawless in execution.⁴⁶ That the Mongol rule in no way affected the greatness of Persian literature is a well-known fact.⁴⁷

The decline of the Seljuq power had already begun when the Mongols appeared upon the scene. The reasons for this phenomenon were evidently deep-seated. Apart from the peculiar conditions in Asia Minor, all empires set up by nomadic peoples like the Turks showed a strong tendency toward disintegration, because they were built up on units like the family and tribe, which could only be held together for a short time by some dominant personality. Furthermore, there was no tradition of strong autocracy among the Turks. The dominions of the ruler would often be divided among his sons, with the result that partitions frequently ended in dissolution, especially if defeat at the hands of a rival power intervened. The Mongols defeated the Seljuqs in 1243. In 1260 they were themselves defeated by the Mamelukes of Egypt. From that time on till the end of the century both the Mongol and the Seljuq powers were wracked with dynastic struggles and antagonisms, in which Egypt played a very prominent part. Under the circumstances it is difficult to see how the Mongol conquest can be made to explain the conditions in the sultanate of Rum.⁴⁸

The most potent cause for the break-up of the Seljuq state was probably the habit of the rulers of granting territory in fief to their followers. The nature of these grants is, however, very obscure and our information on the later twelfth and thirteenth centuries so scant that it is almost impossible to make a definite pronouncement. The older theory, advanced by Hammer, that this practice, like most of the Seljuq culture, was taken over from the Persians, is no longer accepted by students of the problem. It is true that the Arab caliphs,

⁴⁶ MS. 2555 of the library of the Armenian convent of St. James in Jerusalem. Some of the miniatures have been reproduced, rather badly, by A. Tchobanian, *La Roseraie d'Arménie* (Paris, 1918), vol. I., and by F. Murat, *Yaytnut'iun Yovhannu: Hin Hay T'argmanutiun* (Jerusalem, 1905-1911).

⁴⁷ E. G. Browne, *A Literary History of Persia*, II. 443; *id.*, *A History of Persian Literature under Tartar Dominion* (Cambridge, 1920), p. 17.

⁴⁸ The peculiar nature of the Turk state formations is discussed by Barthold, in *Turkestan*, pp. 305 ff. See also the anonymous article on the Seljuqs in the *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, and Hasluck, I. 135.

borrowing the custom from the Persians, assigned large properties and even provinces, or the right to farm the taxes in certain areas, to the great leaders of the state or to soldiers. But it was not until the period of Turkish influence at Baghdad, not until the ninth or tenth century, that this system became closely bound up with the idea of a return in the form of military service rather than in money payments. In 1087 the great wazir of the Seljuqs, Nizāmu'l-Mulk, regularized the practice and established a system of military fiefs. For the first time the grants became hereditary. It stands to reason that this system, the dangers of which Nizāmu'l-Mulk himself recognized as clearly as anyone, was bound to lead to the formation of semi-independent or wholly independent states, especially at times when the ruler was weak or the throne in dispute.⁴⁹

There are at least two instances of considerable grants of this type made by the sultans of Rum in the thirteenth century. About the middle of the century the sultan granted his powerful minister Mo'jin-ud-dīn the territory about Sinope, with the right to pass it on to his son. This was done. There was a direct line of four rulers, who added to their dominions by further conquests, until, about 1300, this area was acquired by the rulers of Kastamuni, who had received that region in the same manner from the Mongol Ilkhan. Even more interesting is the history of the state of Karamania, which played a great part in Anatolian history until its acquisition by the Ottomans in the fifteenth century. Apparently, about the year 1223, a grant of territory was made on the frontier of Rum and Little Armenia, which the Seljuq ruler had conquered from the Armenians. The grantee was given "some Turkman tribes to establish there and guard the frontier."⁵⁰ In the last years of the thirteenth and the first years of the fourteenth century it seems that many similar grants were made by the sultans, for these principalities cropped up like mushrooms.

⁴⁹ Joseph von Hammer, *Des Osmanischen Reichs Staatsverfassung und Staatsverwaltung* (Vienna, 1815), I. 338 ff.; corrected by the writings of Alphonse Belin, *Du Régime des Fiefs Militaires dans l'Islamisme* (*Journal Asiatique*, ser. 6, XV. [1870] 187-301). Paul Andreas von Tischendorf, *Das Lehnswesen in den Moslemischen Staaten* (Leipzig, 1872) adds but little to Belin. The best recent studies are those of C. H. Becker, *Steuerpacht und Lehnswesen* (*Der Islam*, V. [1914] 81-92); Barthold, *Turkestan*, pp. 305 ff.; M. Sobernheim, article, *Ikṭā'* (*Encyclopaedia of Islam*, II. [1927] 461-463); Charles Schefer, *Siasset Nameh: Traité de Gouvernement composé pour le Sultan Melik-Châh par le Vezir Nizam oul-Moulk* (Persian text, Paris, 1891; French translation, Paris, 1893); and Köprülüẓāde Mehmed Fu'ād, *Türkiyâ Tâ'rih-i*, I. 181-184 (bibliography).

⁵⁰ D'Ohsson, III. 489 ff., 500; J. H. Kramers, article, *Karamanoghlu* (*Encyclopaedia of Islam*, II. 748-750).

When Ibn Baṭūṭāh passed through this region about 1340 he noted some twenty-five of them.⁵¹

The earliest Ottoman chronicles are unanimous in saying that Ertoghrlul received territory as a fief from the sultan of Rum for having helped him in his wars with the Mongols. The idea has been rejected with some vehemence by H. A. Gibbons, who stresses the fact that the authority of the Seljuq ruler was, at the time, of the most shadowy character, and who insists that the first Ottomans were "self-made men". There is no evidence to support this contention. On the contrary, there is every reason to suppose that the tradition as we find it in the chronicles is substantially correct. Like the forbear of the Karamanian dynasty, Ertoghrlul was sent to the frontier with a certain number of Turkman tribesmen, to settle there and do guard duty.

Who, more exactly, were Ertoghrlul, Osman, and their followers? So far as one can make out, the stories told in the chronicles are true in all essentials. They were evidently part of the Qaji tribe of the Ghuzz branch of the Turks, the same racial group from which the Seljuqs came and with which the Qun, ancestors of the Cumans of southern Russia, were connected.⁵² If Professor Marquart's theory is correct, they came from the east side of the Caspian Sea, from the region now known as the Krasnovodsk Peninsula. The name Balkan Mountains was evidently transferred to Europe from the Balkan Mountains of that Asiatic area. Marquart accepts the story told by the early chroniclers, that the ancestors of the Ottomans came into Armenia under the leadership of a certain Soleiman, who belonged to the army of the Khwārezm-shāh Jellāl ed-dīn Mankobirtī. The latter took the town of Achlat in 1229, and, as we know from his contemporary biographer, distributed fiefs in the vicinity. Soon afterward he was defeated and driven out by the Mongols; Soleiman, say the chroniclers, decided to return to Khurāsān, but was drowned on the way as he tried to ford the Euphrates.⁵³

⁵¹ These are listed in H. A. Gibbons, *The Foundation of the Ottoman Empire*, appendix A, on the basis of the information in Ibn Baṭūṭāh and Al-'Umarī.

⁵² M. T. Houtsma, *Die Ghuzenstämme* (*Vienna Oriental Journal* [*Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes*], II. [1885] 219-233).

⁵³ Mohammed en-Nesawi, *Histoire du Sultan Djelal ed-din Mankobirti*, translated by O. Houdas (Paris, 1895), pp. 337 ff. On this matter see Josef Marquart, *Ueber die Herkunft der Osmanen* (appendix II. of his *Ueber das Volkstum der Komanen*, in *Abhandlungen der Königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen*, Phil. Hist. Klasse, N. F., XIII. [1914] 25-240). Paul Pelliot, in his detailed review supplementary to Marquart (*A propos des Comans*, *Journal Asiatique*, ser. 11, XV. [1920] 125-185) does not touch upon this aspect of the problem.

The chronicles go on to say that Ertoghrul, Soleiman's son, turning westward, came to the aid of the sultan of Rum and was given territory about Süğüd in return for his assistance. H. A. Gibbons throws out the whole story, on the plea that the reputed fifty thousand followers of Soleiman are not even mentioned by the biographer of Jellâl ed-dîn Mankobirtî. It stands to reason that this figure must not be taken literally. Ertoghrul is said to have settled about Süğüd with four hundred families, which is quite likely nearer the truth. He was in all probability the leader of one of the numerous small Turkish tribes that entered Anatolia at this time, very possibly driven westward by the pressure of the Mongol advance. Even at the present day there are nomadic or seminomadic tribes in Anatolia with names evidently taken from Central Asian villages. These Anatolian names go back to this period.⁵⁴ As for Ertoghrul, he was almost certainly assigned the territory about Süğüd by the sultan of Rum, for it is inconceivable that he should have taken, of his own free choice, one of the most crucial and necessarily most closely watched spots, the frontier of the Greek Empire, for the settlement of a nomadic or seminomadic population.

Ertoghrul himself plays no important part in Ottoman history. So far as we can make out he conquered no territory worth mentioning. Presumably he simply held the front, as he was supposed to do. It was Osman who is reputed to have declared his independence in 1299 and to have set out on a career of conquest. This does not mean that he made a formal pronunciamiento of any kind. The fact was that the Seljuq state went to pieces in the last years of the thirteenth century and that Osman, like many of his fellow vassals, set up on his own, from necessity as much as from choice. The question then arises, how were Osman and Orkhan able, in a short period, to make such important conquests as those of the cities of Brusa (Bursa), Nicæa (Iznik), and Nikomedia (Ismid)?

H. A. Gibbons makes a special point of stressing the weakness of the Byzantine Empire as one of the important factors facilitating the expansion of the Ottoman Turks. He contrasts the relatively strong position of the Anatolian emirates and khanates with the debility of the Greeks, and repeatedly emphasizes the fact that these considerations explain why the Ottoman conquests first extended into Europe,

⁵⁴ Hasluck, I. 128; Leonhard, ch. X. It is worth noting that there is little difference between the old Ottoman language and the Seljuq Turkish. See article, Turkish Dialects, in *Encyclopaedia of Islam* (1931).

rather than toward the south and east. This is a view to which we heartily subscribe. Yet it must be confessed that Gibbons does not go very deeply into the fundamentals. He contents himself with a discussion of the dynastic and religious struggles of the first half of the fourteenth century, and dilates on the dangerous policy of the emperors in calling in men like Roger de Flor and his Catalan followers to meet the raids of the Turks. All this is certainly important, but it is by no means the whole story. Neither does it help much to explain the very first Ottoman conquests in Asia Minor. Everyone knows that the empire of the Paleologi was merely "a slender, dislocated, miserable body upon which rested an enormous head, Constantinople", and that the last two centuries of its existence were a period of "slow and lamentable agony, not worth spending much time upon". They were the last pathetic years of an "ageing organism", years not only of decay, but of veritable wasting away.⁵⁵

But these generalities are not very enlightening. What is needed is a series of detailed studies on the administrative, military, and social history of the empire after 1261. The recent monographs on the Nicæan period and on Michael Paleologus add nothing on this side.⁵⁶ Dölger has illustrated a number of points in the governmental and financial problems of the later period, and Tafrali has published an excellent monograph on the social struggle in Thessalonica in the fourteenth century. This is the type of investigation that is needed for the understanding of conditions in Bithynia.⁵⁷ Taken by and large the best general account of the various aspects of the decline and fall of the Greek Empire is that in the recent volume of Charles Diehl.⁵⁸

Our object must be to recreate, as well as may be, a picture of conditions on the Asiatic front in the late thirteenth century. The

⁵⁵ Charles Diehl, *L'Empire Byzantin sous les Paléologues* (in his *Études Byzantines*, Paris, 1905, pp. 220, 223); A. A. Vasiliev, *History of the Byzantine Empire* (Madison, 1929), II. 265–266; Ernst Stein, *Untersuchungen zur Spätbyzantinischen Verfassungs- und Wirtschaftsgeschichte* (*Mitteilungen zur Osmanischen Geschichte*, II. [1923–1925] 1–62).

⁵⁶ Alice Gardner, *The Lascarids of Nicaea* (London, 1912); Conrad Chapman, *Michel Paléologue, Restaurateur de l'Empire Byzantin, 1261–1282* (Paris, 1926).

⁵⁷ F. Dölger, *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Byzantinischen Finanzverwaltung besonders des 10 und 11 Jahrhunderts* (*Byzantinisches Archiv*, Heft 10, Leipzig, 1927); O. Tafrali, *Thessalonique au Quatorzième Siècle* (Paris, 1912). Still of great value are the researches of V. G. Vasil'ievskii, *Materialy dlya Vnutrennei Istorii Vizantiiskago Gosudarstva* (*Žurnal Ministerstva Narodnago Prosveščeniya*, vol. CCII. [1879], pt. 2, pp. 160–232, 386–438; vol. CCX. [1880], pt. 2, pp. 98–170, 355–404).

⁵⁸ Charles Diehl, *Byzance, Grandeur et Décadence* (Paris, 1919).

Greek domination at Constantinople had been reestablished only a short time before, and the imperial possessions in Anatolia were still essentially what they had been in the time of the Nicæan emperors. That is to say, the frontier ran somewhere on the plateau just north of Eskişehir (Dorylaeum), leaving to the Greeks the three important cities of Nicæa, Nikomedia, and Brusa. From the beginning of the restoration period the Paleologi were unable to pay much attention to this area. Controlling only a few fragments of the territories formerly held by their predecessors, challenged in their position by the ejected Latins, confronted by the demands of the Genoese, Venetians, and other Italians for extensive trading privileges, deprived of anything like an adequate income, and sorely in need of an army and navy, the restored emperors were hardly able to maintain themselves in the face of ecclesiastical and social struggles at home and the standing menace of invasion from abroad.

The Byzantine historian Pachymeres says that Michael VIII., on a visit to his Asiatic possessions sometime after 1261, found this region in the most appalling condition. The cities were ruined and deserted, trees and vegetation were destroyed, and the countryside in many places could not be traversed. The immediate cause for this destruction was undoubtedly the constant raiding of roving Turkish tribes. But other factors were unquestionably of great contributory importance. It must be remembered that for centuries the Anatolian provinces had been the scene of the growing power of what we may call feudalism. Large estates had been emerging, and not even the energetic rulers of the tenth century had been able to put a stop to the process. The Anatolian aristocrats, together with the powerful abbots and ecclesiastical dignitaries were, perhaps, the most virile, active, and able men produced by the later empire, but this does not alter the fact that they became a menace not only to the imperial power, but to the health of the social structure. The investigations of Vasil'ievskii, referred to above, showed that in the period we are considering there were still free peasants in the areas about the Sea of Marmora. This social class had not entirely disappeared, but it is probably true that the large mass of the agricultural population held land under a variety of forms either from a feudal lord or from a monastery. Of the misery of the peasantry there can be little doubt. Weighed down by payments due to their lords, they were more and more exposed to the exactions of the tax collectors sent out by a government which became increasingly indigent. From the time of the first

Turkish invasions the agricultural regions tended to become depopulated. Evidently the peasants were glad rather than sorry to change masters. Others, when they could, escaped to the towns, though it may be questioned whether they found a better lot there. One thing, at any rate, may be taken as certain, that the population of the Byzantine Empire in Asia was not in a very prosperous or happy state of mind. The great Zealot and Hesychast controversies of the fourteenth century, which centered in Thessalonica, were social as much as religious movements. They throw a lurid light on the almost unbearable wretchedness of the common people.⁵⁹

Militarily speaking, the emperors were not able to offer serious resistance to an invader. Ever since the first Arab incursions in the seventh century, a long line of fortified posts had been established to protect the frontier. These were located in or about the mountain passes, and were manned with frontier troops (*akritai*). These forces were quite distinct from the provincial army corps (*tagmata*), and operated only from their strongholds. Rarely were they drawn off on campaigns in other areas. In the earlier period they were composed of rough and ready military men, of great daring and energy. The emperors placed implicit trust in them and rewarded them with large grants of land or military fiefs. When the frontier was thrown back into northwestern Asia Minor as a result of the Seljuq invasions, less adequate fortifications appear to have been erected, so the frontiersmen were of greater importance than ever. The Nicæan emperors treated them with great consideration, endowing them with lands, relieving them of taxation, and looking indulgently upon their great wealth. It seems that a worse element established itself in this line of work. In the famous tenth century epic of *Digenis Akritas*, the frontier guards appear as the valiant defenders of the empire and Christianity against the infidel—splendid men, great in valor and great in love. But by the end of the thirteenth century, traits of cruelty and violence had become more prominent.

Evidently the *akritai* had become more of a bane than a blessing. After the reconquest of Constantinople in 1261, Michael VIII. proceeded against them. He had a census taken and in 1265 confiscated all their landed property, giving the owners a compensation of only forty pieces of gold. It turned out, however, that the soldiers were stronger than

⁵⁹ Stein, *loc. cit.*; Vasiliev, *Byzantine Empire*, II. 147 ff., 386 ff.; Charles Diehl, *Byzantine Civilisation (Cambridge Medieval History, vol. IV., ch. XXIV.)*, and especially his *Byzance*, bk. III., chs. II., III., VI.

the emperor. They rose in revolt in the usual fashion, and the decrees could not be put into effect. After this the defense system seems to have become completely demoralized. The emperors at best could muster an army of only ten or twelve thousand men and when, in 1329, Andronicus II. and John Cantacuzene proceeded against the Ottoman Turks they took only some two thousand trained troops with them. All the rest of the army was mere rabble, intent on saving its own hide and plundering the country as it went. The burden of the battle was borne by some three hundred knights, and they made a poor enough showing. Under the circumstances it is easy to understand how the first Ottoman rulers, even with their small following, were able to accomplish what they did.⁶⁰

Our understanding of the course of the earliest Ottoman conquests will be considerably facilitated if we bear in mind the peculiar topographical conditions of the region in which Ertoghrlul and his men had been established. They were on a high and rather barren tableland north of Eskişehir. In all probability they had come along the great trunk road from Armenia, the course of which has been so well studied by Taeschner.⁶¹ The winter pastures of these tribes appear to have been north of Süğüd, while the summer pasturage was farther to the west, on the Dumanij Dagħ. In their first conquests the Ottomans simply pushed along the road, that is, northward down the valley of the Kara Su, along which, in the opposite direction, went the Crusaders and along which runs the modern railway. This brought them, along the old roads retraced by Taeschner, to Bilejik and then to the lower country in which lie the cities of Brusa, Yenişehir, Nicæa, and Āq-Hişşār. Such is the account of the earliest known chroniclers, Šükrüllāh and Uruj, and we have no reason to question it. The movement from the dry, barren uplands to the thicker vegetation of the river valleys and the better grazing areas

⁶⁰ Chapman, ch. XI.; Vasiliev, *Byzantine Empire*, II. 292 ff.; Diehl, *Byzance*, bk. III., ch. VII. The best study of the military organization in this period is by P. Mutaščiev, *Voiniski Zemi i Voinitsi v Vizantiya prez XIII-XIV Veka* (*Spisanie na Bolgarskata Akademiya na Naukite*, Kn. XXVII., Klon Istorio-Philologichen i Filosofsko Obščestven, XV. [1923] 1-113). See also the detailed review of this article by F. Dölger, in the *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, XXVI. (1926) 102-113.

⁶¹ Franz Taeschner, *Das Anatolische Wegenetz nach Osmanischen Quellen* (Türkische Bibliothek, nos. 22, 23, Leipzig, 1924, 1926); *id.*, *Die Verkehrslage und das Wegenetz Anatoliens im Wandel der Zeiten* (*Petermanns Mitteilungen*, Bd. LXXII. [1926], Heft 9/10).

on the north side of Olympus and ultimately to the richer, busier lowlands about Brusa and Yenişehir was the most natural thing in the world.⁶²

Whatever may have been the exact state of cities like Brusa and Nicæa at the beginning of the fourteenth century, we know that they were strongly walled towns, probably surrounded by many smaller forts and outworks. Nicæa must have been a town of some thirty to forty thousand inhabitants. It had enjoyed a period of splendor during the thirteenth century, when it was the capital of the Greek Empire⁶³. So far as one can make out, it was still quite a busy place about 1300.

According to the early chronicles the Ottomans besieged these places for many years, building forts opposite the Greek outworks and gradually cutting off these cities until they surrendered. We do not question the accuracy of this account of Turkish tactics, but the question arises why nomadic or seminomadic tribes should have wanted to go to all this trouble. H. A. Gibbons gives a peculiar reply to this query. After rejecting most of the traditional account and making fun of the ridiculous stories concerning the origins of the Ottomans which were circulated by Western writers in the sixteenth century, he seizes upon the story told by the Turkish chroniclers of a dream attributed to Ertoghrul or Osman and upon the Arabic name of Osman in order to build up the theory that Osman and his followers first became converted to Islam at this time and embarked upon their conquests from religious motives. Now the story of the dream is utterly unconvincing. It appears in the chronicles in the most divergent forms. One can not even decide whether it was Ertoghrul or Osman who saw the vision of empire. Besides, the prototype of the story can be found as far back as the history of Herodotus. It is

⁶² Taeschner, *Anatolische Forschungen* (*Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft*, LXXXII. [1928] 83-118). Wilhelm Tomaschek, *Zur Historischen Topographie von Kleinasien im Mittelalter* (*Sitzungsberichte der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, vol. CXXIV., Abh. 8, Vienna, 1891) deals chiefly with the coastal areas and the routes of the Crusades, but see Colmar Freiherr von der Goltz, *Anatolische Ausflüge* (Berlin, 1896) and the detailed geological and geographical study of Alfred Philippson, *Reisen und Forschungen im Westlichen Kleinasien*, Heft III. (*Petermanns Mitteilungen*, Ergänzungsheft no. 177, 1913). Richard Hartmann's *Im Neuen Anatolien* (Leipzig, 1928) is predominantly archæological and artistic.

⁶³ See especially Johannes Soelch, *Historisch-Geographische Studien über Bithynische Siedlungen: Nikomedia, Nikäa, Prusa* (*Byzantinisch-Neugriechische Jahrbücher*, 'I. [1920] 263-337).

not a very firm foundation for a key argument.⁶⁴ Neither is Osman's name of any consequence.⁶⁵

It is almost a certainty that the Ottoman Turks, like almost all Turks, were Moslems even before they left Central Asia. In fact, it is very likely that the Mongols, who were pagans but who were much more favorably disposed toward the Christians than toward the

⁶⁴ See especially J. H. Mordtmann's observations (*Der Islam*, XIII. [1923] 152-169).

⁶⁵ This question has caused so much trouble for so long a time (see Theodor Nöldeke, in *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft*, XIII. [1859] 185, n. 5) that a few words of explanation may be in order. In Anatolia, proper names are so frequently and so completely corrupted that philological derivations are of little use. Al-'Umarī calls Osman *Taman*, and Pachymeres and Nicephoras Gregoras call him *Atman*, so that the suggestion has been made that his name may really have been Turkish—*Azman* or something like it (see F. Giese, *Das Problem der Entstehung des Osmanischen Reiches*, in *Zeitschrift für Semitistik*, II. [1923] 246-271). On the other hand, Ibn Baṭūṭāh calls him Osman, and so he appears on the first coins, struck in the reign of Orkhan ('Ali, 'Oṭmānli İmperatorluğunun ilk Sikkesi ve ilk Aqçesi, in *Tâ'riḫ-i 'Osmāni Enjūmeni Mejmū'-asi*, VIII. [1917] 48). Of course, this in itself does not prove that his name was originally Osman, or that he was always a Moslem. It should be recalled that after the Turkish invasions many Armenian and Georgian Christians adopted Islamic names, and that Ertoghrl's father bore the common Arabic name, Soleiman. A clew may be found in Ibn Baṭūṭāh's statement that Osman's name had a suffix, *jiq* or *juq*. He says this signified Osman the Little, to distinguish him from Osman the third caliph. Giese (*loc. cit.*) thought that it might have been a term of endearment; and Huart (*Journal Asiatique*, ser. II, IX. [1917] 345-350) has suggested that it might have been connected with the town of Osmanjiq (or zich), just south of Sinope on the Qizil Irmaḡ. This idea has been developed by J. H. Kramers (Wer war Osman? in *Acta Orientalia*, VI. [1927] 242-254), who has pointed out that the town had the name in the early thirteenth century and that the practice of naming persons from the locality of their birth was by no means unusual. From the confusion of the early chronicles regarding the names of Ertoghrl's sons, Kramers tried further to establish the theory that Osman was not a real son, but a man who joined Ertoghrl as he and his followers passed through Osmanjiq. It may be, however, that Osmanjiq was a perfectly good Turkish name. Maḥmūd of Ghazna, the great Turkish conqueror of Persia and India, had, according to a contemporary writer (Al-'Utbi in the early eleventh century) an uncle named Bughrājuq and a general named Tughhājuq (see Muḥammad Nāzim, *The Life and Times of Sulṭān Maḥmūd of Ghazna*, Cambridge, 1931, pp. 32, 37, 39, 46, 48, 67), and a later Turkish writer tells of a Turkish general of the eleventh century named Osmanjiq Beg. Ḥājji Khalifa, the great Turkish traveler, says the town of Osmanjiq got its name because it was conquered by a general named Osman, in the tenth century! (See A. D. Mordtmann, *Die Dynastie der Danischmende*, in *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft*, XXX. [1870] 467-486). As a piquant detail it may be mentioned that Donado da Lezze, one of the earliest Italian historians of the Ottomans, says explicitly that the first member of the dynasty was Zich, who was the father of Ottoman (Donado da Lezze, *Historia Turchesa, 1300-1514*, I. Ursu, ed., Bucharest, 1910, p. 4). We do not know what this suffix *jiq* or *juq* signified and the original form of Osman's name evidently can not be determined.

Moslems, forced the emigration of the Turk tribes from Central Asia by their religious persecution, of which the Arab and Persian sources make bitter complaint. After all, racially the Mongols and the Turks were very closely related.

Though we think that Gibbons's theory of the conversion of Osman to Islam will hold no water whatever, we do believe that religion played some part, perhaps an important part, in the story of Ottoman expansion.

We have already pointed out the mystical trend and the dervish influence in Turkish Mohammedanism, as well as the part played by these factors in the Turkification and Moslemization of Asia Minor in the time of the Seljuqs. Now the Mongol conquests sent another flood of dervishes and holy men into Asia Minor from Transoxania, Persia, Iraq, and Syria. In all probability they moved along in the company of the migrating Turkish tribes. It is interesting to note that the ancestor of the Karaman dynasty was a Šūfi sheikh and that the Sarukhan dynasty in the fourteenth century was closely connected with the Mevlevi order of dervishes.⁶⁶ We have every reason to suppose that the early Ottoman rulers were under similar religious influence. It is said that the earliest document bearing on religious grants in the Constantinople archives goes back to 1294-1295, and it is a fact that among the earliest Ottoman buildings in Brusa were mosques and medresses.⁶⁷ It has been claimed, in fact, that the Janissary corps was established through the efforts of Hājji Bektash, the founder and patron of the famous Bektashi order and the reputed friend and adviser of Osman or Orkhan. If true, the story would go far toward explaining the *élan* of the early Ottoman conquerors.

The story is found in many of the early chronicles, though it is warmly disputed by one of the oldest, 'Ašīkpašazāde. A classic version of it is contained in a recently published dervish manual attributed to Bektash himself. The book dates from the early fourteenth century, and is therefore older than any known Turkish account of the origins of the Ottoman Empire. Erich Gross, the editor, was disposed to attribute to it considerable value as an historical source, though the nature of the book is against its acceptance as serious historical ma-

⁶⁶ J. H. Kramers, article, Karamanoghlu (*Encyclopaedia of Islam*, II. 748-752); Franz Babinger, article, Sarukhan (*ibid.*, IV. 177-178).

⁶⁷ J. Deny, in *Histoire et Historiens depuis Cinquante Ans* (Paris, 1927), I. 453; Taeschner, *Anatolische Forschungen* (*Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft*, LXXXII. [1928] 83-118); Taeschner and Wittek, *Die Vezirfamilie der Gandarlyzāde und ihre Denkmäler* (*Der Islam*, XVIII. [1929] 60-115).

terial.⁶⁸ As a matter of fact, there appears to be nothing substantial in this legendary account. The researches of other scholars, like Browne, Jacob, Köprülüzâde, and Hasluck, have shown convincingly that Bektash himself lived in the early part of the thirteenth century and that he was a popular, none too orthodox dervish leader. He had nothing to do with the founding of the order that bears his name, nor, in fact, with the establishment of the Janissaries. His disciples, about 1400, fell under the influence of a Persian mystic and agitator named Faḍlu'llah, the founder of the Ḥurūfî sect. With this sect the followers of Bektash became merged. They may have had some connection with the serious religious and social upheaval under Sheikh Bedr-ed-din in 1415-1416, and they were certainly involved in the uprising of the first quarter of the sixteenth century. It was only after this period that their connection with the Janissaries began. The association was recognized in the late sixteenth century, and from that time on the Bektashi dervishes lived in the barracks of the Janissaries and accompanied them on their campaigns. The point is important, for the Bektashi were as much a sect as an order, and were far removed from good Sunnite orthodoxy. They were careless of matters like circumcision, veiling of women, regular prayer, abstention from drink, etc., and were closely related to Shi'ah Mohammedanism and even Christianity. These traits are still very pronounced among the Kizilbash tribes of Anatolia, who are visited each year by a Bektash dervish, known by them as a rabbi, who administers to them the sacrament!⁶⁹ It can not be that this association of Janissaries and heterodox dervishes was welcome to the Ottoman government. Evidently the weak sultans who followed Soleiman the Magnificent

⁶⁸ Erich Gross, *Das Vilajet-name des Haḡḡi Bektasch* (Türkische Bibliothek, no. 25, Leipzig, 1927), especially pp. 199 ff. See the severe criticism of the editor's conclusions by H. H. Schaeder, *Zur Stiftungslegende der Bektaschis* (*Orientalistische Literaturzeitung*, XXXI. [1928] 1038-1057). The story is given in the traditional form in Theodor Menzel, *Das Korps der Janitscharen* (*Beiträge zur Kenntnis des Orients*, I. [1902-1903] 47-95).

⁶⁹ E. G. Browne, Further Notes on the Literature of the Hurufis and their Connection with the Bektashi Order of Dervishes (*Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, July, 1907, pp. 533-581); Georg Jacob, *Beiträge zur Kenntnis des Derwisch-Ordens der Bektaschis* (Türkische Bibliothek, no. 9, Leipzig, 1908); *id.*, Die Bektaschijje in ihrem Verhältnis zu Verwandten Erscheinungen (*Abhandlungen der Philosophisch-Philologischen Klasse der Königlich-Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, vol. XXIV. [1909], pt. 3); Köprülüzâde Mehmed Fu'ad, Les Origines du Bektachisme (*Actes du Congrès International d'Histoire des Religions*, Paris, 1925, II. 391-411); Hasluck, I. 159 ff.; vol. II. ch. XL.; Leonhard, ch. XI.

were unable to do anything about it, but it is significant that Maḥmud II., in 1826, attempted to abolish the Bektashi order together with the Janissaries. On the other hand, he showed great favor to the orthodox and perfectly loyal Mevlevi order.

Though the Bektashi, as such, evidently had no connection with the first Ottoman rulers, other dervishes did. Taken by and large, the dervishes aimed at the reconciliation of Christianity and Islam. They put little store by doctrinal differences and ceremonial practices. Some were downright missionary in their aims, like the Ishāqī, who are reputed to have converted to Islam thousands of fire worshipers and Jews in Persia, India, and China before they appeared in Anatolia.⁷⁰ There were not a few shrines in Anatolia that were frequented indiscriminately by Christians and Moslems alike. In fact, it is difficult to draw any fundamental distinction between the Turkish dervishes on the one hand and on the other the numerous zealots, mendicant monks, pilgrims, wanderers, and madmen who swarmed through Byzantine territory in the time of the first Paleologi. H. A. Gibbons is probably right in assuming that there was widespread apostasy on the part of the Greeks, who found the change of religion a not very considerable one and discovered that it was a useful expedient. Many accepted Islam outwardly, while still remaining Christian in faith and feeling. There is a most curious letter, written in 1338 by the patriarch at Constantinople to the Greeks at Nicæa, in which he offers to take them back into the Church, even if they made no public renunciation of Islam. There was a Christian monastery in Nicæan territory as late as 1395, as there were many Christian monasteries at all times in lands ruled by Moslems. Dawkins quotes a document of the year 1437, which shows only too clearly what took place:

Notandum est, quod in multis partibus Turcie reperiuntur clerici, episcopi et archiepiscopi, qui portant vestimenta infidelium et locuntur linguam ipsorum et nihil aliud sciunt in greco proferre nisi missam cantare et evangelium et epistolas. Alias autem orationes dicunt in lingua Turcorum.⁷¹

⁷⁰ Köprülüzâde Mehmed Fu'ad, Abū Ishāq Kāzerūnī und die Ishāqī Derwische in Anatolien (*Der Islam*, XIX. [1930] 18–26).

⁷¹ Dawkins, p. 1, n. 1, cited from *Neos Hellēnomnēmōn*, VII. [1910] 366. On the Anatolian shrines, see Hasluck, vol. II., ch. XXVI. The letter of the Greek patriarch, in Wächter's *Der Verfall des Griechentums in Kleinasien im XIV. Jahrhundert*, pp. 56–57. The conditions in the Greek Church and the activities of popular agitators are discussed by Vasiliev, *Byzantine Empire*, II. 366 ff., and by Diehl, *Byzance*, bk. III., ch. IV.

We have still to consider the military side of the activities of the first sultans, and here we come into a most difficult subject, on which the final word can not be said yet. Ibn Baṭūṭāh, recounting his experiences in Anatolia in the period just after the conquest of Brusa and Nicæa, tells of associations of men which he found in all the towns, and which did much to make his stay pleasant. They were called *Akhi*, and were composed of unmarried men of the same profession who selected a chief and established a community. A house was built and furnished. The members of the association worked all day and brought to the chief the money which they earned. With this the necessary supplies were bought. The whole thing was on a communal basis, but beyond providing for the exigencies of everyday life the Akhi made a special point of housing and entertaining strangers. The great Arab traveler was immensely impressed with this organization and its hospitality. He says specifically that at Brusa he stayed at one of their hospices.⁷²

Exactly what were these associations, which, incidentally, had a certain religious basis? Hammer believed that the religious orders of the Islamic world were the prototypes of the orders of chivalry in the Western world. There are some recent writers who still insist that not only the medieval orders, like the Templars, but later Christian organizations like the Society of Jesus, drew their inspiration from this source.⁷³ Whatever the truth in this matter may be, considerable progress has been made of late in the study of the Akhi organizations. These recent investigations have been based, in very large part, upon the *Futūvvat-nāmē*, or Book of Chivalry, written, so it seems, in the fourteenth century by a certain Yahyā ben Khalīl. Chivalry is perhaps a misleading term, for the *Futūvva* included all the ideas which we associate with chivalry, together with the moral ideas of Moslem religious brotherhood and the ideas of professional solidarity. The word Akhi does not come from the Arab word for brother, as Ibn Baṭūṭāh thought, but is a purely Turkish word meaning knightly or noble. It is likely, therefore, that the Akhi were Turkish organizations fitting into the general framework of Moslem chivalry or *Futūvva*. They go back at least to the time of the Caliph Nasir (1180-1225) for

⁷² *Voyages d'Ibn Batoutah*, II. 260 ff.

⁷³ Joseph von Hammer, *Sur les Passages relatifs à la Chevalerie dans les Historiens Arabes* (*Journal Asiatique*, ser. 5, VI. 282-290); D. B. Macdonald, p. 219; G. Bonet-Maury, *Les Confréries Religieuses dans l'Islamisme et les Ordres Militaires dans le Catholicisme* (*Transactions of the Third International Congress for the History of Religions*, Oxford, 1908, II. 339-345).

the Arab sources tell of his reformation of the organization and his protectorate over it.⁷⁴

Following suggestions made by Huart and Babinger, Giese first worked out the connection between these Akhi organizations and the early Ottomans. He was able to mention by name a number of Akhi associated with the first sultans, and recalled that the chronicles tell us that Osman surrounded himself with "fast young men" who evidently belonged to these groups. Kramers, in the article already referred to, went so far as to suggest that Osman may himself have been a leader of the Akhi, who joined Ertoghrul as he passed through Osmanliq, a town which seems to have been a veritable center of dervish organizations.⁷⁵ But these investigators tended to lay too much emphasis on the religious aspects of the Akhi organizations, and to identify them with the dervish orders. Taeschner was able to show that in Angora, for example, they played a prominent part in governing the city during the fourteenth century, and German scholars who have interested themselves in the problem are now inclined to put more stress on the mundane side of their activity.⁷⁶

So far as one can determine, the Akhi were the more prominent men in the community, joined in professional groups and living according to certain religious precepts. Their rise and spread in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries may well have had some connection with the expansion of trade and the revival of towns under Seljuq rule. In Anatolia the town or municipality had not played a

⁷⁴ Hermann Thorning, *Beiträge zur Kenntnis des Islamischen Vereinswesens* (Türkische Bibliothek, no. 16, Berlin, 1913); the articles of Vladimir Gordlevski, in *Zapiski Kollegii Vostokovedov*, II. [1926-1927] 235-248, and *Izvestia Akademii Nauk SSSR* (1927), pp. 1171-1194; Köprülüzaade Mehmed Fu'ad, *Türk Edebiyyâtında ilk Mütessavvîler, passim*, and especially Franz Taeschner, *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Achis in Anatolien* (*Islamica*, IV. [1929] 1-47). On the Futüvva, see M. Deny, *Fütüvwet-name et Romans de Chevalerie Turcs* (*Journal Asiatique*, ser. 11, XVI. [1920] 182-183); H. Ritter, *Zur Futuwwa* (*Der Islam*, X. [1920] 244-250); Franz Taeschner, *Das Futuvvetname des Jahjä b. Halil* (*Orientalistische Literaturzeitung*, XXI. [1928] 1065-1066) and his more recent article, *Die Türkischen Futuvvetnames und ihre Religionsgeschichtliche Stellung* (*Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft*, LXXXIV. [1930] 87-88).

⁷⁵ F. Giese, *Das Problem der Entstehung des Osmanischen Reiches* (*Zeitschrift für Semitistik*, II. [1923] 246-271); Kramers, *Wer war Osman?* (*Acta Orientalia*, VI. [1927] 242-254).

⁷⁶ See especially Taeschner's review of Rudolf Tschudi's *Vom Alten Osmanischen Reich* (Tübingen, 1930), in *Deutsche Literaturzeitung*, ser. 3, I. [1930] 1664-1667, and the discussion in Taeschner, *Die Türkischen Futuvvetnames*, etc. (*Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft*, LXXXIV. [1930] 87-88).

prominent rôle before this period. Individual cities may have reached a considerable degree of prosperity and of population through political or economic causes, but so far as we can see the rulers of the surrounding territory always kept a firm and solid grip upon these urban centers. The Seljuq and Mongol conquests appear to have wrought a decided change in the situation. In Armenia the Mongols built new roads and cleared the old ones of bandits and robbers. During the thirteenth century many of the towns along the chief trading routes displayed unusual prosperity and the population took an active part in seeing that this prosperity was maintained. One of the most striking ruins in the capital of the Armenian dynasty of the Bagratids at Ani is the tremendous caravanserai of the city, which recent investigations have shown was built by the merchant guilds during the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, when the very existence of the town was not noted in the historical annals. Similar great structures in this area and in other districts of Asia Minor were constructed, enlarged, or rebuilt at this time. The private organizations which did the work exhibited an energy and enjoyed a control of resources that is truly quite startling.⁷⁷

The immensity of the Mongol conquests made extensive trade much simpler than it had been. It was the time of the journeys of Marco Polo, Plan de Carpini, and other famous European travelers. The towns on the main routes began to boom. But it seems that the arrangements for the escort of travelers, as well as for their reception and housing, were managed by the merchant guilds rather than by the Mongol authorities. The influence of the merchants certainly grew rapidly at this time. When disturbances closed the trade routes, these people tended to emigrate *en masse* to more fertile centers of enterprise, such as the Crimea, Constantinople, and the various harbor towns of the Levant.

Were the Akhi guilds pure and simple? It depends on what is meant by the term. They bear little resemblance to the guilds which were widespread in the Greek world from Hellenistic times onward, or to the Byzantine guilds, of which we know relatively little. These organizations were more strictly economic. The Byzantine guilds

⁷⁷ The best general sketch is still that of W. Heyd, *Histoire du Commerce du Levant au Moyen Age*, translated by Furcy Raynaud (Leipzig, 1883), II. 3 ff., 73 ff. See also the itineraries through Asia Minor in F. Pegolotti, *Pratica della Mercatura* (Pagnini, ed., Lisbon, Lucca, 1766), pp. 7-13. On Ani, see the detailed archaeological study of N. Marr, in the *Revue des Études Arméniennes*, vol. I. [1921], no. 4, pp. 395-410).

were under close government supervision and resembled the medieval guilds of Western Europe more than the associations of the Islamic world.⁷⁸ W. M. Ramsay, who was struck by Ibn Baṭūṭāh's account of the Akhi, tried to establish a connection between them and the Xenoï Tekmoreioi, or Bearers of the Sign, who were organized along similar lines, had distinct religious connections, kept a communal treasury, and made hospitality one of their chief duties. He pointed out that Ibn Baṭūṭāh found the Akhi chiefly in towns of Anatolia where there was a large non-Greek and presumably pre-Greek population. One thing is certain. The Akhi were economic organizations.⁷⁹ Ibn Baṭūṭāh says that at Adalia the society consisted of two hundred silk merchants. But they also pursued political, perhaps even military, activities. The old Turkish chronicler, 'Aṣīḳpaṣazāde, says that there were parallel organizations of dervishes and soldiers, and even a women's association. Of these we know nothing definite. We are not even able to speak with great assurance of the Akhi. But if Osman was an Akhi leader, if he had these people in his *entourage*, the fact is of great importance. It helps to explain not only the Ottoman push to the cities of the Bithynian lowlands, but also the remarkable ability shown by the Ottomans from the very beginning in matters of state organization. For a people purely nomadic or even seminomadic this was truly astonishing.

The "fast young men" in Osman's following, whether they were Akhi or members of some kindred organization, may well have been the forerunners of the Janissaries. The origin of this famous body is still a mystery, though it can be said with assurance that H. A. Gibbons's theory that the rapid Islamization of Christian territory was due in large measure to the tribute in Christian children exacted by the sultans, is devoid of foundation. Neither Ibn Baṭūṭāh nor Schiltberger (late fourteenth and early fifteenth centuries), nor La Broquière (mid-fifteenth century) speaks of such a tribute in connection with the organization of the Ottoman forces. Their silence can not, of course, be taken as conclusive, but the system as we know it from a later

⁷⁸ See Franz Poland, *Geschichte des Griechischen Vereinswesens* (Leipzig, 1909), and the article, Berufsvereine, in Pauly-Wissowa, *Real-Encyclopädie der Classischen Altertumswissenschaft*, Supplementband IV. [1924], pp. 155-211; Hans Gehrig, Das Zunftwesen Konstantinopels im 10 Jahrhundert (*Jahrbücher für Nationalekonome und Statistik*, ser. 3, XXXVIII. [1909] 577-596; Albert Stöckle, *Spätromische und Byzantinische Zünfte* (*Klio*, Beiheft 9, Leipzig, 1911); G. Zoras, *Le Corporazioni Bizantine* (Rome, 1931).

⁷⁹ Ramsay, I. 97.

period is the more remarkable in that it was contrary to the essential principles of Islam, which prescribed that all non-Moslems outside the Arabian Peninsula should be free to practice their religion on condition that they paid a capitation tax. Nothing like this levy of children can be found in the history of any other Moslem state.⁸⁰ The Janissaries evidently grew out of an earlier body of troops known as the *Yahyā*, which, in turn, may have been a derivation from some sort of military, semireligious organization. There was much in the organization of the Janissaries analogous to the Christian orders of knighthood.⁸¹ In any case, the *Yahyā* were a sort of enlisted infantry, established to supplement the irregular cavalry known by the name of *Akinji*. They are interesting because they antedated the first standing armies of France and even the companies of archers in England. If Huart is right, the Janissary corps were modeled on the legions of the Byzantine Empire, which, in turn, were derived from the Roman legions. Throughout the fourteenth century they were probably recruited as they were in the fifteenth, not from the Christian tribute children, but from war prisoners. There was nothing novel in this system. The Turkish Mameluk sultans of Egypt built up their power by means of a slave army, recruited almost exclusively from Christian territory. Impressment and the levy of Christian children were only gradually and irregularly resorted to in Turkey in order to keep the ranks of the regiments filled. The numbers of the Janissaries were very small, even in the time of Soleiman. But their peculiar weapons and their admirable training and discipline seem to have been wonderfully effective in all their engagements with Christian forces.⁸²

The Ottoman state, then, rose from among a fairly large number of small principalities that succeeded to the heritage of the sultanate of Rum. Its position was peculiarly favorable, because it made possible considerable conquests at the expense of the moribund Byzantine Empire. But the first sultans had more than a mere horde of nomads to rely upon. There was an efficient military organization which was

⁸⁰ Hasluck, vol. II., ch. XL.; J. H. Mordtmann, article, *Dewshirme* (*Encyclopaedia of Islam*, I. 952-953); Clément Huart, article, Janissaries (*ibid.*, II. 572-574); Menzel, *Das Korps der Janitscharen* (*Beiträge zur Kenntnis des Orients*, I. [1902-1903] 51-52).

⁸¹ Heinrich Schurtz, *Die Janitscharen* (*Preussische Jahrbücher*, CXII. [1903] 450-479).

⁸² Huart's review of Gibbons's book in *Journal Asiatique*, ser. 11, IX. [1917] 345-350; *id.*, *Les Origines de l'Empire Ottoman* (*Journal des Savants*, n. s., XV. [1917] 157-166); Giese, *loc. cit.*; Taeschner and Wittek, *Die Vezirfamilie der Gandarlyzâde* (*Der Islam*, XVIII. [1929] 60-115); Menzel, *loc. cit.*, pp. 50-52.

evidently based upon something resembling merchant guilds and religious orders. These organizations supplied the impetus to the conquest of the Greek cities in Bithynia, they enabled the sultans to establish a governmental system, and they facilitated the conversion of a large part of the Christian population to Islam, thus giving the new state a firm popular basis. Much undoubtedly remains to be learned about them and about the whole early history of the Ottomans. But enough is already known to make possible a thorough revision of ideas that have been current all too long.

WILLIAM L. LANGER,
ROBERT P. BLAKE.

Harvard University.